

Amendments to the Drawing Figures:

The attached drawing sheet includes proposed changes to FIG. 3A and replaces the original sheet including FIGs. 3A-3C.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS/DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-13 are pending in the application.

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority and receipt of certified copies of all the priority documents.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to state whether the drawings are acceptable.

OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS

By this Amendment, Applicants amend FIG. 3A to label it as prior art.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

RESPONSE TO ELECTION REQUIREMENT

The Office Action states that:

"The species are independent or distinct because:

Species I, as illustrated in Figs. 3B-3E, features the characteristics of a waveform;

Species II, (Figure not shown) feature the elements of a first and second waveform generator."

Applicants elect the so called "species" I *"featur[ing] the characteristics of a waveform."*

Applicants also submit that all of the claims 1-13 read on the elected "species" and furthermore, to the extent that the identified "species" even exist, also respectfully submit that all of the claims are generic to both "species."

This election is **with traverse**.

At the outset, the so-called "species" identified above are not even species in the first place! Species are classes of things included with other classes in a genus. Applicants respectfully submit that there is no genus that includes a first class of things that "feature the characteristics of a waveform" and a second class of things

that "feature elements of first and second waveform generators." The Office Action fails to identify any such genus – most likely because no such genus exists. What the Office Action incorrectly labels as "species" are instead non-independent and indistinct features of various embodiments of a plasma display device.

Even if these features did somehow define separate "species," the Office Action fails to provide any analysis, explanation, or reasoning to support the conclusory statement that "*the species are independent or distinct.*" See M.P.E.P. §§ 802.01, 806.04, and 808.01 ("**A mere statement of conclusion is inadequate**"). Indeed, the Office Action seems incapable of even deciding whether the so-called species are "independent" or whether they are instead "distinct."

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the election requirement be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing explanations, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and reexamine the present application, allow claims 1-13 and pass the application to issue. In the event that there are any outstanding matters remaining in the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact Kenneth D. Springer (Reg. No. 39,843) at (571) 283.0720 to discuss these matters.

Respectfully submitted,

VOLENTINE & WHITT

By: 
Kenneth D. Springer
Registration No. 39,843

VOLENTINE & WHITT
One Freedom Square
11951 Freedom Drive, Suite 1260
Reston, Virginia 20190
Telephone No.: (571) 283.0724
Facsimile No.: (571) 283.0740